EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE JOURNAL

THE JOURNAL

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER.

C. S. JACKSON.....Publisher

Published every evening (except Sunday) and every Sunday morning, at The Journal Building, Fifth and Yamhill streets, Portland, Or.

Entered at the postoffice at Portland, Or., for transmission through the mails as second-class matter.

TELEPHONES—MAIN 7173. HOME, A-6051.
All departments reached by these numbers. Tell the operator the department you want. East Side office, B-2444; East 839.

FOREIGN ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE.
Vreeland-Benjamin Special Advertising Agency, Brunswick Building, 225 Fifth avenue, New York; Tribune Building, Chicago.

Subscription Terms by mail to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

DAILY.
One year.....$5.00 | One month.....$ .50
SUNDAY.
One year.....$2.50 | One month.....$ .25
DAILY AND SUNDAY.
One year.....$7.50 | One month.....$ .65

A man is an ill husband of his honor that entereth into any action, the failing wherein may disgrace him more than the carrying it through can honor him.—Bacon.

"CONSTITUTIONAL" OBJECTIONS.

IN HIS August speech at Corvallis, Senator Fulton expressed doubt as to the constitutionality of senatorial elections by Statement No. 1. Editor Scott says such elections are not constitutional. All the pee-wee politicians are probably cuckooing the phrase, "not constitutional."

But, alas for their contention, there is Bourne in the senate of the United States. If the plan had the slightest irregularity, if there were the remotest shadow of unconstitutionality, Bourne and Mulkey could no more have secured entrance to the senate than Secretary Taft could enter the eye of a needle. The fact that Bourne is senator from Oregon, that he attends the senate daily, that he votes, introduces bills, and performs the functions of his office just as freely and fully as does Senator Fulton, is complete answer to all this talk about constitutionality.

Incidentally, was it "constitutional" for Representative Smith of Linn to have been paid, as is admitted, $1,500 in a senatorial election at Salem? Was it "constitutional" when "men of the highest character, whose honor in other matters was never questioned, went to lengths and did things which they no doubt regretted ever after," as Senator Fulton says? Was it "constitutional" for a whole session of the legislature to be tied up for 40 days, and, after tens of thousands of dollars had been spent in trafficking for senatorial votes, at the end, no senator elected? Was it "constitutional" if Jonathan Bourne was paid $25,000 and promised in addition all the federal patronage and the influence of a morning paper and its evening appendage, in consideration of his support in the senatorial struggle of 1903? Was it biennially "constitutional" for every pee-wee politician of the state to repair to Salem, to buy and sell, barter and bully, traffic and trade, and howl and hiss throughout the state capitol, in a bedlam of boodle and legislative loot, from the session's beginning to its end? The Lord save the "constitution" from its Oregon defenders.

A WORD TO MR. HODSON.

MR. C. W. HODSON, through the medium of a paid advertisement in a Portland paper, announces to the public: "The Portland Journal, in its anxiety to defeat me as a candidate for the Republican nomination for state senator, accuses me of being an advocate of Boodle, Booze and Bribery," and he adds an expression of the hope that "all decent citizens will make a note of The Journal's methods."

Of course The Journal made no such charge, nor was there, in the article to which Mr. Hodson alludes, the slightest attack upon his personal character. We have no reason to believe that Mr. Hodson was ever paid money for his own vote upon any measure during his service in the state legislature, nor that he was ever a party to the bribery of any other legislator. So far as the use of intoxicants is concerned, he bears the reputation—no doubt well merited—of being exceedingly abstemious. These facts The Journal has always recognized and has always been ready to state without any expense to Mr. Hodson. It is not necessary for him to resort to the advertising columns of any other paper in order to place them before the public.

But The Journal did say and it reiterates that Mr. Hodson has been a persistent advocate of a return to the old method of electing senators by the vote of an unpledged legislature; it did say and it reiterates that "boodle, booze and bribery" were common and almost inevitable incidents of that method, and no man familiar with past senatorial elections in Oregon can gainsay it. Mr Hodson himself knows well that in the senatorial struggle of 1903, when he was a member of the lower house, money was used freely and in large amounts in the effort to affect the result. Mr. Hodson knows that bribes were offered during that session to members of the legislature and as an intelligent man he must be aware that this had been a common practice during previous sessions for many years.

Knowing those things, Mr. Hodson has nevertheless been one of the foremost opponents of the principle of popular election of United States senators, as embodied in Statement No. 1 of the direct primary law, and he has advocated, openly and persistently, a return to the system of leaving the choice of the senator to a practically unpledged legislature. It is of course a familiar fact that throughout his political career Mr. Hodson has been closely identified with the Republican machine, but The Journal has not thought it necessary to discuss that feature of his candidacy. We have deemed it sufficient to confine comment to the one fact that he is uncompromisingly opposed to the principle embodied in Statement No. 1. We have refrained from anything that savored of personal attack upon Mr. Hodson or upon any other of the legislative candidates with whom he is associated. The Journal's campaign has been conducted upon clean, straightforward lines and has been a fight for principle, not for or against any individual.

In conclusion, we have a word of advice to offer to Mr. Hodson. We suggest that he refrain during the remainder of the campaign from deliberately distorting The Journal's utterances in the effort to make capital for himself. We suggest that his complaints against this paper be stated candidly and fairly, and for any such statement he will find the columns of The Journal open. If he desires to prove that "boodle, booze and bribery" were not familiar concomitants of the old system of electing United States senators, well and good—he is welcome to the task. But if he desires to prove that he, personally, was not concerned in such practices, it would be well for him to wait until he is charged with them.

WOMEN, WORK, AND HOME.

MISS THOMPSON, a lecturer, says that industrialism continues "more and more to draw people out of their homes and herd them in factories. Machinery is becoming more and more automatic, so that less skill is required to operate it and one operative is able to superintend the work of half a dozen machines or even more, as in the cotton mills. In such cases a child can serve quite as well as an adult, and then because of the reduced wages that a child can demand, the tendency is to resort to such labor. There is an unproved theory that child labor is crowding adult labor out and that society is tending toward an era when adults will be entirely devoted to the rearing of children to be worn out in factory life."

This is a large-city view and is probably true in spots; but we think it overdrawn. However, it is worth noticing. Women don't have to go into industrial life, at least in the west, unless they choose to do so. If they insist on doing so, there is no way to stop them; but we think that all reasonable advisory voices—press, pulpit, club and home—should constantly and persistently advise woman that her highest, noblest and truest mission is wifehood, motherhood, housekeeping, homekeeping.

Too many girls think this sort of life too humdrum, tame, trivial; they need to learn the great truth that homekeeping and motherhood is the average woman's true mission. This is the divine, eternal law; immutable as the stars.

The Detroit News says:

Attempts are constantly being made to regulate human affairs by law, but the laws cannot be nicely adapted to changing conditions. There can be no question but the family is a better unit of civilization than the individual. Except in rare cases, the child that is deprived of home life is impaired in his development. There are a few parents whose greed for gain impels them to force their children into the factories at too early an age and to keep them there too much of the time. For each one case of this sort there are probably 100 families who are forced against their will and by keen necessity to sacrifice the best welfare of the children who are of working age because the high cost of living makes it impossible for people who have large families to support them unless every one capable of earning a little finds employment. The human species has not yet reached a state of development where natural parental love is lost. In the homes of 99 out of every 100 workingmen the chief ambition is that the children may reach a higher social status than their parents. Sacrifice is made to give them the best possible chance.

Read this over, girls, twice. It contains a lot of truth. The happiest person we ever knew is a grandmother!

A FANTASTIC PLEDGE.

THE most fantastic of all the pledges yet filed by legislative candidates is that of the Rev. P. A. Bonebrake of Benton county. It runs thus:

"I further state to the people of Oregon, as well as to the people of my legislative district, that I will always vote for that candidate for United States senator in congress who has received the 'majority' of the people's votes at the general election next preceding the election of United States senator in congress."

The trick in the statement is at once apparent. For the words "highest number of votes" in Statement No. 1, Rev. Mr. Bonebrake substitutes the word "majority," and lets it go at that. Though purporting to take a pledge giving the people the right of selection, he, in fact, takes a pledge that is not likely to be of any value whatever.

There will be both a Prohibition and a Socialist candidate for senator, as well as one Democratic and one Republican candidate, to be voted for in June. The Prohibition and Socialist candidates will receive 3,000 to 4,000 votes each, in fact, together may receive 10,000. There is not the slightest probability therefore that either the Republican or Democratic candidate can secure a majority of all the votes cast.

Wherefore Mr. Bonebrake will be released from his pledge and will have carte blanche to do as he pleases, if elected. The clerical eye of Mr. Bonebrake has discerned this and with a cunning unaccustomed in the ministry has let loose his program on the unsuspecting people of Benton county. But will the game work?

MR. PAYNE GETS ANGRY.

MR. PAYNE, the Republican house leader, has been smoked out. The Democrats are forcing the majority to show their hand, to some extent. Payne, according to report, was angry, and "shouted at the top of his voice" that the Republicans would carry out their program, in spite of the pestering Democrats. What that policy or program is, nobody knows, though it is reported that Payne said that an employers' liability law would be passed; that it had been the intention all along to pass it. Since the last swing of the Big Stick, we imagine. But what about the other 16 or 18 bills that Roosevelt urged? What about interior waterways, and real currency reform, and the duty on paper and wood pulp, and a lot of other things? That Payne got mad and shouted is rather a good sign. The Democratic minority is doing a little good by provoking the Republican majority to anger. Possibly if Payne, Dalzell, Cannon et al are pricked and prodded enough, they may do a trifle of good for the country, after all.

THE "REPUBLICAN PARTY."

"THE Statement No. 1 people, we are told, are to put up their own ticket after the primaries, in counties where they have now no candidates. This shows how much the advocates of Statement No. 1 are interested in the success of the Republican party."—Oregonian.

Why should the average voter care about the "success of the Republican party"—or the Democratic "party" or any other party? Do we live, breathe and move, in, of, for and by "party."

The Oregonian itself has been fighting the main and practically the only "principle" of the Republican party these 40 years, namely, the protective tariff; why should it be so tender and tenacious about "party" now?

Who represents and speaks for the Republican pary—Roosevelt and La Follette, or Foraker and Elkins? If it be so awfully necessary just now to save the Republican party, we would like to know what it believes in, what it stands for—the 17 laws Roosevelt insists on, or the standpat policy represented by Cannon, Payne and Dalzell. We thirst for information.

The morning paper stumbles onto the truth occasionally. It says, for instance: "If the election is to be settled by the vote in June, there is no need of sending men to the legislature either as Republicans or as Democrats." It really is not important whether Republicans or Democrats are elected, if the people are well served.

Nearly all Democrats have registered as Republicans, asserts the morning paper. Then there must be some Democrats in Oregon, after all—or at least voters who are not always machine Republicans.

The registration list is crawling up, but not as fast and far as it should. It should run up to 32,000 or more. The voters are here.

If the railroad commission of Oregon can make its order stick, it will be another great victory for Oregon.

Nearly all business men seem to be opposed to the Aldrich bill. But Morgan wants it.

Letters From the People

The Rule of the People.

Portland, March 31.—To the Editor of The Journal—Government means sovereignty, power, rule. The right, or power at least, to rule, must be lodged somewhere, and with somebody. The governments of the old world were put in the crown, or at least, in the hands of a few. The people were hardly considered. If they were thought of at all it was as "subjects," to be used as the crown saw fit. All "rights" were in the crown, and the ruling few. The people had no "rights." They only had such "privileges" as the crown graciously granted them. History tells how this concentration of power marked cruelty and injustice. The great body of the people were robbed and plundered, and exploited for the glory of the crown, and the maintenance of special privileges.

The men who formed the American government said this idea of government was wrong. That instead of one man being born, saddled and bridled, and another born booted and spurred to ride him, all men are born with equal natural rights, and that all are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. So, they said the power of government shall be taken out of the hands of the few, and placed in the hands of the many. They said the majority of the people can be more safely trusted to form and administer just and good government than the crown and his advisers, and they put the government in the hands of the people. They turned the old ideas upside down. They reversed the old order completely, placing power where it of right belongs, and where it must and will stay.

True, these ideals have not been perfectly carried out in practice, but they must not be lost or abandoned for all that. Men have not practiced the golden rule very much yet, but it is beautifully true, nevertheless, and I believe will prevail at last. Under the new order of things this government was not to have "rulers" over it, but "public servants," to transact its business. This country was to be a republic and not a despotism.

Washington, with his great comprehensive mind, saw the logic of the new situation, and deplored the fact that so many Americans failed to see it. These Americans could not shake off the old man from across the sea. They were aristocrats at heart and loved concentrated power and special privilege. The crown, the crown! They worshipped it, and distrusted, or hated, the "rabble," the "mob," the common people—who dare believe that they could administer public affairs?

We have a dreg of that same love of power, and of special privilege, and distrust of public virtue, among us yet. Uppish people who like to occupy the high seats in the synagogues, and hold the public offices, but who do not like to consult public opinion, or consult the people whose patronage they seek. They want to be "rulers," not "servants." In office, they want to serve their own interests, and not the people's. They feel they are a sprig of royalty, a "laird" in the hatching, and wear too good clothes to be told by just "common people" what they shall do and how to do it. They want to go back to the old wallow out of which our fathers lifted the governmental concept. If the people ask these embryo rulers to respect the popular choice for United States senator, with a haughty wave of the hand they reply, "No tag for me! Don't I know, better than you, who should be your senator?" Is it dishonorable or unmanly for an employe to take orders from his employer? Are not the people in power and authority, and have they not a right to say what shall be done?

It seems almost incredible that in this day and age, and with all our experience in government, there seems to be call for the discussion of matters so rudimentary and fundamental. Is a man, who by hook or crook secures a seat in the legislature a "ruler," who need not unbend, to take pointers from the "mob," or is he, just for the time being, a "public servant," whose sole duty is, so far as he has gumption enough to comprehend the wishes of his constituents, to do their will and obey their orders? Which?

To make this plain matter plainer, if possible, apply it to other affairs. Suppose one out of employment should seek and find it in a bank, or business house. Because his services were accepted would he therefore become a manager of the business? Could he rightfully refuse to take orders from the proprietors who gave him his place? Would he wear a "tag" if he did the work assigned him? Need he feel humiliated because his employer tells him what to do and how to do it?

To ask such questions is to answer them, and the principles involved apply with equal force and clearness to the man who takes a legislative position. He goes to the legislature, not on business of his own, or of his own creating, but he goes to serve the public, and to do the work the public wants done. If he should go there to fill his own pockets, he ought to be recalled, just as the proprietors of a bank or business house would turn a man out who, though an employe only, should insist on his right to run the establishment as he saw fit, and not as they wanted it done.

It all depends on where the right of government is, and who is to be served. If the crown is in power, it must be served. If the people are in power, they must be served. If the politicians are in power, they will serve themselves. No doubt about that. A candidate who will not obey the public voice ought not to be elected to the legislature.

LEVI W. MYERS.

Yukon and Oregon Dredging.

To the Editor of The Journal—In perusing the Yukon gold advertising put out by Thomas Lawson the question comes to my mind, how many people in Oregon really know anything about dredging, the method the Alaska company will use, and how many realize what dredging can be made to mean in Oregon. I really do not believe that there is one single claim Thomas Lawson makes for his Guggenheim Dredging company of Alaska that cannot be made in far stronger terms in regard to Oregon possibilities, especially in Baker county, where the greatest gold wealth of our state has been found. Dredging is a mining method that wholly eliminates the element of chance. Simply speaking, the presence of gold is first determined, next the practicability of working the dredge on the particular area in question, and then the work begins—as sure and simple as digging potatoes. I understand the greatest gold dredge in the world is now successfully working at Gold Hill, and plans are under way for dredges in the southern part of the state as well as in Baker county. Then why do we not hear more about Oregon as a gold dredging center? Why does Alaska loom so largely on the horizon in this regard? Simply because Oregon's dredging opportunities, like so many of her other industries, have not been brought into the limelight. Fortunes are to be made in this one industry alone, and it is as yet unknown. Those who take up the dredging work before eastern capital has snapped up these opportunities will find themselves capitalists in the future.

E. B. HAIGHT.
229 Beach street, Portland.

April.

The wet mind blows along the lane
A thrill of laughter faint and wild;
'Tis April come again—
Inimitable child!

She plays her pranks with every bud,
And haunts it like a frolic ghost:
But violets o' the wood
She teases most.

They open wide their wondering eyes;
She greets them with a shower of rain,
And then at their surprise
She laughs again.

—Grace Hazard Conkling in April Ainslee's.

Gold Beach Globe: After a delay of three weeks the Agness paper mail arrived here Thursday and the patrons of the postoffice started home so loaded with packages and paper that little of them but their ears could be seen.

REFERENDUM MEASURES TO BE VOTED ON—NO. 12

The twelfth in the list of 19 initiative and referendum measures to come before the people at the June election, deals with tax law amendment. The form of the proposed measure as it will appear on the offical ballot is as follows:

Proposed by Initiative Petition.

For constitutional amendment providing that all dwelling houses, barns, sheds, out houses, and all other appurtenances thereto; all machinery and buildings used exclusively for manufacturing purposes and appurtenances thereto; all fences, farm machinery, and appliances used as such; all fruit trees, vines, shrubs, and all other improvements on farms; all livestock; all household furniture in use; and all tools owned by workmen and in use, shall be exempt from taxation in addition to exemptions now authorized by the constitution. Vote yes or no.

322. Yes.
323. No.

The amendment, as it has been prepared for submission to the people is as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Section 1 of Article IX of the constitution of the state of Oregon shall be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

Section 1. The legislative assembly shall provide by law for uniform and equal rate of assessment and taxation; and shall prescribe such regulations as shall secure a just valuation for taxation of all property, both real and personal, excepting that all dwelling houses, barns, sheds, out houses and all other appurtenances thereto, all machinery and buildings used exclusively for manufacturing purposes and the appurtenances thereto, all fences, farm machinery and appliances used as such, all fruit trees, vines, shrubs, and all other improvements on farms, all livestock, all household furniture in use, and all tools owned by workmen and in use, shall be exempt from taxation; excepting also such property for municipal, educational, literary, scientific, religious or charitable purposes, as may be specially exempted by law.

The following argument has been submitted in support of the amendment:

Step to Single Tax.

To the voters of Oregon: The proposed amendment is a step in the direction of the single tax. If adopted it would exempt most personal property and improvements from taxation, and the argument submitted has in view that all such property will ultimately be exempted. It does not exempt business buildings, merchandise, cash, improvements of public service corporations, and a few other articles of personalty and improvements. The Oregon Tax Reform association, composed of men who have devoted their lives to the common good, seeing the injustice and iniquitous results of our present system of taxation, which has been so carefully defended and unscrupulously evaded, by the various special interests and monopolies, feel certain that the time has arrived and the people are ready to abolish this effete and iniquitous system and institute a better, just, and more certain method of taxation. We have, therefore, determined to submit the above amendment to remove taxation from industry and place it on land values. We will prove that this amendment if carried will benefit the farmer, workingman, manufacturer, merchant and, in short, every producer. We will show that taxes will fall on those monopolies which have, through our present tax laws, complacently levied an outrageous toll on industry and have filched from Oregon hundreds of millions of dollars of publicly created values. Henry George has well stated the results that will follow the adoption of this amendment:

"To appropriate ground rent to public uses by means of taxation would permit the abolition of all the taxation which now presses so heavily upon labor and capital. This would enormously increase the production of wealth by the removal of restrictions and by adding to the incentives to production. It would at the same time enormously increase the production of wealth by throwing open natural opportunities. It would utterly destroy land monopoly by making the holding of land unprofitable to any but the user. There would be no temptation to any one to hold land in expectation of future increase in its value when that increase was certain to be demanded in taxes. No one could afford to hold valuable land idle when the taxes upon it would be as heavy as it would be were it put to the fullest use. Thus speculation in land would be utterly destroyed and land not in use would become free to those who wish to use it. The enormous increase in production which would result from this throwing open the natural means and opportunities of production while at the same time removing the taxation which now hampers, restricts and fines production, would enormously augment the annual fund from which all incomes are drawn. * * *"—Henry George, Social Problems, page 285.

No Property Rights.

The attorney-general has stated that in his opinion this amendment will exempt the particular things which it specifies. These may be summed up as the two basic pursuits of production and home building. The effect of the law now in operation is to encourage monopoly and discourage industry—to subsidize monopoly and fine production, to take from the individual a portion of the product of his labor and give it to the land monopolists (and it should be remembered that every monopoly is at base a land monopoly) for every improvement, which results from expenditure of taxes, enhances the value of the land adjacent to the improvement. On the other hand the value of any given site is not earned by the owner. He has contributed no more to its value than any other member of society living near it. The entire population have jointly created this value and should take it for public uses. A concrete illustration will make this more apparent.

Some 40 years ago Mr. McGinn paid $1,500 for the southeast corner of Seventh and Washington streets, Portland. This site is at present covered with mere shacks, but it is safe to say it has yielded him a net income of more than $100,000. On the 25th day of January, 1908, Mr. McGinn leased this location for 25 years, the lessee to erect thereon a substantial building of not less than six stories, pay a rental of $1,000,000, pay all taxes, assessments incident to all city improvements and forfeit the building to Mr. McGinn at the end of the term. Meanwhile Mr. McGinn lives in southern California, pays no taxes, produces none of the rental value of this location even indirectly, but simply appropriates $1,000,000 net of wealth produced by somebody. This simply illustrates the method by which monopoly at all times and everywhere filches wealth from industry. Data of the above taken from the Oregon Daily Journal, January 25, 1908. We do not condemn Mr. McGinn, but the system of taxation that permits it.

All authorities agree that taxation of land value is the only just, certain and efficient method of taxation. It has been partially adopted in New Zealand, Manitoba and locally in other countries, and in every instance has given rise to a prosperity never before known. The farmers of Manitoba are the most prosperous in the world, and New Zealand has never known hard times or business depression since its adoption. On the contrary it is universally known that New Zealand's prosperity is superior to any other portion of the globe with the same population. In Manitoba the law reads that no improved farm shall be assessed higher than the vacant land along side. The effect of our amendment will be identical. It will relieve the farmer by allowing improvement to be made without increasing the taxes of the improver.

Fine on Honesty.

The farmer usually insists on taxing everything. Under such a system the farmer pays taxes on everything, while the bulk of the wealth drained from the farms to the cities always and everywhere eludes the assessor. Such a system is a fine on honesty and a premium on prejury. The most honest official cannot guess anywhere near the value of the vast and various forms of wealth in the cities—cannot tell the difference between a $200 and a $500 carpet. On the other hand, the country assessor knows the worth of the farm wagon, and can estimate within 10 per cent the value of all the farmer has. Under this amendment the greatest taxation will fall where the land is most valuable. A whole farm can be purchased for $5,000. One block 200 feet square in the city of Portland is worth $1,000,000. The value of this one block would purchase 20,000 acres of farming land at $50 per acre. This block would pay as much taxes as 20,000 acres of $50 per acre farming land.

The land values of Portland and the other large cities of Oregon are more than seven times as great as the value of all the farming lands of Oregon, yet they pay only 40 per cent of the taxes. The area of all the farming lands in this state is 11,000,000 odd acres and the farming population 100,000. The railroad lands, timber monopolies and cities of Oregon constitute over 26,000,000 acres, and the population of the cities about 335,000. Therefore under our present system the product of 40 per cent of the area pays over 60 per cent of the taxes, while the product of 60 per cent of the land (the most valuable land) pays less than 40 per cent of the taxes. That is to say, less than one fourth of the population pays 60 per cent and three fourths of the population only pay 40 per cent of the taxes. This is glaringly unjust.

The supreme court recently nullified the customary $300 exemption of farmer's and householder's belongings, yet under the same law millions upon millions of monopoly values go free. It should be noted that if this amendment is adopted, the taxes will fall in an increased amount, not upon land as land, but upon land values, thereby relieving the farmer.

Oregon discourages the investment of capital and manufacturing enterprises with high taxes. The people and the papers continually clamor for the investment of capital and the production of wealth. Then why discourage it? Are not our laws highly absurd; laws that allow useless and nonproductive monopolists to hold out of use thousands of natural manufacturing sites? That they are absurd is shown by the vivid fact that Eugene, Albany, Astoria, Salem, Portland, The Dalles and other cities have from time to time offered and paid bonuses of from $2,000 to $20,000 to induce mills and factories to the respective cities, and have further offered to partially or wholly exempt them from taxation. What does this mean if not the fact that these communities have consented to purchase of landlordism the privilege to have an industry in their midst? For in almost every instance the bonus offered or given has equaled the value of the desired site and the taxes for a term of years which under our present system are adroitly levied on industry for the benefit of monopoly. This amendment will bring into the state millions of dollars of capital now going to other communities where no attempt is made to tax manufacturing enterprises. That freedom from taxes will cause manufacturing plants to enlarge and new ones to be established need hardly be argued. To this manufacturers all agree.

Foster Trade.

As high-tariff men would say, "to stimulate manufacturing will provide a home market for Oregon farmers" both for raw material for the factories, and produce for the increasing population; will save freight charges on many commodities now shipped across the continent; while home competition would lower the cost of manufactured articles.

Believers in a protective tariff readily see this and low-tariff men consider it a fairer way of fostering manufacturing industries.

Baltimore, Atlanta and Birmingham, under the policy of exemption, have become great manufacturing centers. There is no reason why Oregon should not do likewise. Note that this amendment would not exempt the location of manufacturing plants, nor the timber lands of millmen.

The proposed amendment will, as in the case of the farmer, benefit every working man by making employment plentiful—by creating an abundance of opportunities and a scarcity of labor. This condition invariably gives rise, must give rise, to ever advancing wages. For increased demand for workers lessens the supply of competing labor and the law of supply and demand universally governs the price of exchanges.

Monopoly is the curse that has in all countries and all times bound the many in poverty and want and made millionaires of the few. It will be evident to any thoughtful man that if we abolish monopoly the conditions will be reversed. For to abolish land monopoly is to open up to labor the opportunity and the use of land. While land is monopolized industry must suffer. The destruction of monopoly by taxation will permit the use of land from which all wealth is directly or indirectly produced. And as employment of land in building, cultivation and manufacturing increase, so the demand for labor must increase. The relinquishment of lands, now held at enormous speculative prices, will make possible the rearing of homes and release men from the blighting curse of landlordism.

Every new home broadens and strengthens the base of society. We have seen above how monopoly filches tribute from production. It is self-evident that as ground rent falls so wages must rise.

The working man in whatever capacity he labors, farmers, clerks, artisans, mechanics and all should bear clearly in mind that the present system of taxation shifts the whole load of taxation on the consumer, while monopoly, or landlordism, like the robber barons of old, holds the people in subjection and levies tribute even from the sick and destitute. In spite of the depression that compels many to want and idleness, rents have increased in Portland. It is the old trait that marks its history—tribute for the right to live.

Boon to Labor.

The amendment will benefit all workers, by multiplying demand for labor in factories, on farms and in construction and distribution, by making them independent through free use of land, by making of each a home owner, and by increase of wages which will rise as rent—monopoly power—falls.

Vacant lots and land grants buy no dry goods or groceries. The merchant will readily see in the amendment a wide opportunity for industry, a greater employment of labor, higher wages, and an ever enlarging fund for purchase or exchange. He will see that exemption of the farmer's improvements and the discouragement of idleness of land will enable and stimulate a greater purchase of building material, machinery, furniture, apparel and sundries. Justice does not discriminate. She benefits all alike. We have but to obey her and that prosperity which only she can give will be our recompense.

The amendment will enable the banks to loan the millions of deposits on actual development of industry instead of on speculative schemes to discount future growth. It will turn the able brains at the heads of great public service corporations from schemes of monopolization to expanding their proper business as common carriers. It is opposed only to those interests which fence natural opportunity away from enterprise and industry. By shifting taxes to land value and discouraging the holding of vacant land it will foster home building, and lands now barren wastes will teem with wealth and population. Bank failures and panics will disappear, for failures usually and panics always are caused by schemes of speculation in corporation franchises or special privileges over the land of the public streets and highways.

Oregon will derive more advertisement from its adoption of this amendment, attract more capital and settlers than all the money ever spent for that specific purpose, and it will place this state on a line with the most progressive sections of the world.

This is no war on persons—no appeal to class or personal interests, but to progressive public spirit to amend a tax system which has encouraged injurious speculation and discouraged the increase of industry and wealth. After more than 40 years of statehood, Oregon had only 435,000 population in 1900. Her area is twice as great as New York, about as large as Old England and New England combined. They surpass her in population 100 times while she surpasses them in all that should draw population and enterprise. If Oregon were as densely populated as Rhode Island she would have 45,000,000 people. This amendment appeals to that thoughtful conservatism which knows that we have opened too wide the door to speculation. Oregon is rich in opportunity. It is only required to amend the laws that the abundance of nature may be free to the hand of industry.

OREGON TAX REFORM ASS'N.
(Indorsed) Filed February 3, 1908.
F. W. BENSON, Secretary of State.

The REALM of FEMININE

The Timely Duty.

IT is worth while remembering, and heeding, that the only possible preparation that we may make for the cares and responsibilities of life is by a simple day by day faithfulness to each day's tasks.

A man is seldom thrust into a large sphere of usefulness, unprepared. His duty done day by day smoothes the way for his feet to travel to the larger duty. And one opportunity let slip may be the one loose stitch in the whole life's weaving—undoing the whole. Who can call back again wasted opportunities? Who can go back again and do the thing that was left undone yesterday?

It is a far-reaching thought, and it comes home to all of us. Our friend is ill, and we are too hurried to give him the few moments out of a day that would have brought him strength and refreshment. Can we make it up by lavishing kindness upon him when he is well? Then he does not need our care.

It is a lesson that it is hard for youth to learn, for youth is ever looking forward to glorious deeds afar off. And yet one who is in the heat and burden bearing of middle age has no chance to prepare for these tasks. His time of preparation was that same golden youth which too often ignores the present duty in the fatuous glow of possibility.

The opportunity of today may look like a poor shrunken little brown seed. But plant it, and the fragrance of the flower shall be yours.

* * *

Hints on English.

NOTHING more clearly stamps a man's or a woman's educational standing than the use or misuse of our common speech, and young people who wish to hold the esteem of cultured people cannot afford to overlook or ignore the simple rules of structural English. The misuse of capitals is an important point in this connection.

Some years ago a freer use of capitals was permitted than is now considered good form. In the somewhat stilted and precise letters of our grandmothers' time, such words as summer, winter, father, brother, madame, sir, professor, college, club, consulate, were all italicized. Indeed some of these older epistles fairly bristle with capitals, each person or thing spoken of being given this honorable distinction. In writing modern English, such common nouns are never capitalized. These simple rules for capitals as given by Luella Carson of the University of Oregon, should be committed to memory by those who know that they have lapses of memory along these lines. Indeed the whole of this little work is of great value, and every stenographer in a business office should have it and know it. These are the main rules for capitals. Begin with capitals:

1. The first word after a period; and, usually, after the interrogation point and exclamation point.
2. The first word of every line of poetry.
3. The first word of an exact quotation in a direct form, as, "He said, 'There will be war.'"
4. The first word of every direct question, as, "He said, 'Who will go?'"
5. The pronoun I and the interjection O. Oh, only when it begins a sentence.
6. Proper nouns.
7. Adjectives derived from proper nouns, unless, by long usage, they have lost all association with the nouns, from which they are derived, as, "Christian," "damask."
8. The words street, river, mountain, etc., when they are used in connection with proper names, as, "Columbia River."
9. The words north, south, east and west, and their compounds, whenever they refer to parts of the country, and not simply to points of the compass; or general direction.
10. Names of the days of the week and the months of the year. This rule is amplified to include days of feasts and fasts, festivals and holidays, as, "Tuesday," "Christmas," "Bank Holiday." Do not capitalize names of seasons, as, "She came in the summer."

* * *

For the Sick Room.

MUTTON BROTH—One pound lean mutton or lamb, cut small; one quart cold water; one tablespoonful rice or barley, soaked in warm water; four tablespoonfuls milk; salt and pepper; a little chopped parsley. Boil the meat, unsalted, in the water, closely covered, until it falls to pieces. Strain it out, add the soaked barley or rice; simmer half an hour, stirring often; stir in the seasoning and the milk, and simmer five minutes, taking care not to burn. Serve hot with cream crackers.

Sago Gruel—Two cups water, two tablespoonfuls sago, three teaspoonfuls white sugar, one half pint of milk, one tablespoonful lemon juice, nutmeg to taste, and a pinch of salt. Put the sago in the water while cold, and warm by setting in a saucepan of boiling water. Stir often and let it soften and heat for one hour. Then boil 10 minutes, stirring all the while; add the milk, the sugar and lemon and pour into a bowl to cool. Eat warm, if preferred.

Toast water—Slices of toast, nicely browned, without burning, boiling water to cover. Pour over the boiling water and let the toast steep until cold. Strain off the water, sweeten to taste, and put a piece of ice in each glassful. If the physician thinks it safe, add a little lemon juice.

Mint tea, made from the green leaves, crushed in cold or hot water, and sweetened, is palatable and healing to the stomach and bowels.

Sage tea, sweetened with honey, is good for a sore throat, used as a gargle, with a small bit of alum dissolved in it.

Margaret Anglin's Birthday.

Mary Margaret Anglin, the celebrated American actress, was born April 3, 1876, at Ottawa, Ontario. She studied for the stage in a New York dramatic school and her first appearance in a school performance attracted the favorable attention of Charles Frohman, under whose management she later acted for several seasons, ultimately becoming the leading woman of his Empire theatre stock company. Her professional work began with the role of Madeleine West in "Shenandoah" in 1894 at the Academy of Music, New York. Her first important parts were Mercedes in "Monte Cristo," Virginia in "Virginius" and Ophelia in "Hamlet"—all played with James O'Neill. Her most momentous achievements have been Roxane in "Cyrano de Bergerac," Mrs. Dane in "Mrs. Dane's Defense," Mabel Vaughan in "The Wilderness," Marguerite Gautier in "The Lady of the Camelias," Hester Trent in "Zira," Frou Frou Paula in "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" and Ruth Jordan in "The Great Divide."

This Date in History.

1366—Richard II of England born at Bordeaux.

1783—Washington Irving, American writer, born in New York City. Died at Irvington, New York, November 28, 1859.

1797—Francis L. Lee, one of the signers of the American Declaration of Independence, died. Born October 14, 1734.

1822—Edward Everett Hale born in Boston.

1837—John Burroughs, famous American naturalist, born at Roxbury, New York.

1854 — John Wilson (Christopher North), Scotch writer and poet, died. Born May 19, 1785.

1865—Federal troops occupied Richmond, Virginia.

1898—China leased Wei-Hai-Wei to Great Britain.

1902—Large section of Atlantic City destroyed by fire.